

Remarks

The appellant has filed herewith a Request for Continued Examination and paid the necessary fee with an enclosed check for \$395.00.

The forgoing amendment has been made after a careful review of the present application, the references of records, and the Office Actions dated April 3, 2006, May 19, 2006, and June 16, 2006. In the Office Action of April 3, 2006, the examiner indicated that claims 5 and 6 would be allowed if placed in independent form and rejected claims 7 through 10 under 35 USC 112 because the language, as recited therein, indicates that both first and second paddle assemblies would be in the drum at the same time. Claims 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 USC 112 and claims 2 through 4 and 14 were rejected under 35 USC 102 (b) as being anticipated by Gontero.

In the forgoing amendment, claim 3 has been amended to incorporate all the elements of claim 5 such that amended claim 3 is claim 5 placed in independent form. The examiner has indicated that claim 5 would be allowed if placed in independent form, and therefore amended claim 3 is believed to be allowable. Claim 6 was previously dependent upon claim 5 and was indicated by the examiner as being allowable. Claim 6 has been amended to be dependent upon amended claim 3, which now incorporates all the elements of claim 5, and is therefore also allowable. Since claim 4 is dependent upon an allowable claim, it is believed that claim 4 is now allowable.

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 USC 112 as being confusing because claim 7, upon which claims 8 through 10 were dependent, implies that both paddle assemblies

are to be in the drum at the same time. This is clearly not the intent of the invention and the applicant has amended claim 7 to more clearly recite that it includes "means for removably retaining one of said first and second paddle assembly in said drum...." Duplicate language regarding removing the first paddle assembly has also been deleted. With this amendment to claim 7, the applicant traverses the rejection under 35 USC 112. As amended, claim 7 clearly indicates that only one paddle assembly is to be in the drum at a time. This is the inventive feature of claim 5 and it is therefore believed that the examiner has already searched this structure and determined that this feature is patentable.

Claims 8 through 10, which are dependent upon claim 7, are also believed to be allowable since they are dependent on an allowable claim.

Claims 11 and 12, which the examiner rejected under 35 USC 112 have been canceled.


Claims 3 and 14 have been amended to incorporate the recitation that the first and third axis define a first plane, the second and third axis define a second plane, and that the angle of intersection of the planes is an angle of at least one hundred twenty degrees. This amendment brings claim 14 close to the elements of cancelled claim 1 except that the angle between the planes is stated as being at least one hundred twenty degrees rather than one hundred degrees. The one hundred twenty degree angle is in fact the minimum angle as disclosed in the specification, rather than the one hundred degrees originally set forth in the claims; see page 3 line 22 to page 4 line 3 and page 9 lines 9 to 16 of the present specification. Gontero, on the other hand, discloses an

angle of only one hundred and five degrees between a similar set of planes. Clearly, amended claim 14 defines over Gontero.

New claims 15 and 16 have been added, which are dependent on claims 14 and 3 respectively and state that the angle formed by the various axes is no more than one hundred forty degrees. This maximum angle is also disclosed on page 3 line 22 to page 4 line 3 and on page 9 lines 9 to 16 of the specification.

It is submitted that the forgoing amendment places the application in condition for allowance because the examiner has already searched a drum driven by only one drive shaft and the shafts supporting the drum defining planes forming a defined angle. On the other hand, if the examiner believes a further search is required, the applicant submits that the forgoing amendment should nonetheless be entered, because it reduces the issues on appeal since it provides for the cancellation of claims and sets many of the claims in allowable form. Reconsideration and allowance is therefore requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert L. Marsh
Attorney for the Applicant
Registration No. 25894
630-681-7500
630-681-3464 (fax)

RLM:ksc

Robert L. Marsh
P. O. Box 54
Wheaton, Illinois 60189-4468